

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TORRES).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last four lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Titles I through V, the appropriations paragraphs of title VI, and sections 601 through 604, of this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4569) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 542, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 255, nays 161, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—255

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Camp
Aderholt	Bishop	Canady
Allen	Bliley	Cannon
Andrews	Blumenauer	Cardin
Archer	Blunt	Chabot
Armey	Boehlert	Chambliss
Bachus	Boehner	Christensen
Baesler	Bonilla	Coble
Baker	Bono	Collins
Ballenger	Boswell	Cook
Barcia	Boyd	Cooksey
Barrett (NE)	Brady (TX)	Costello
Bartlett	Brown (CA)	Cox
Barton	Bryant	Crapo
Bass	Bunning	Cubin
Bateman	Burr	Davis (VA)
Bentsen	Burton	Deal
Bereuter	Buyer	DeLay
Berman	Callahan	Deutsch
Bilbray	Calvert	Diaz-Balart

Dickey	Kim	Ramstad
Dicks	Kingston	Redmond
Dixon	Klug	Regula
Dooley	Knollenberg	Riley
Doyle	Kolbe	Rivers
Dreier	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Dunn	LaHood	Rogan
Ehlers	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehrlich	Lantos	Rothman
Emerson	Largent	Roukema
Engel	Latham	Ryun
English	LaTourette	Salmon
Ensign	Lazio	Saxton
Everett	Leach	Schaefer, Dan
Ewing	Levin	Schaffer, Bob
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Serrano
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Sessions
Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Fowler	Linder	Shaw
Fox	Lipinski	Shays
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Sherman
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Frost	Lowey	Shuster
Gallegly	Maloney (NY)	Sisisky
Ganske	Manzullo	Skeen
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Gibbons	McCollum	Slaughter
Gilchrist	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Gillmor	McDade	Smith (NJ)
Gilman	McGovern	Smith (OR)
Goodlatte	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Goodling	McInnis	Smith, Linda
Graham	McIntosh	Snowbarger
Granger	McIntyre	Solomon
Green	McKeon	Souder
Gutierrez	McKinney	Spence
Gutknecht	Menendez	Stabenow
Harman	Metcalfe	Strickland
Hastert	Mica	Talent
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Hastings (WA)	Morella	Taylor (NC)
Hayworth	Nadler	Thomas
Hill	Nethercutt	Thornberry
Hinchey	Neumann	Thune
Hobson	Ney	Thurman
Holden	Northup	Tiahrt
Hooley	Norwood	Tierney
Horn	Nussle	Turner
Houghton	Ortiz	Upton
Hulshof	Owens	Visclosky
Hunter	Oxley	Walsh
Hutchinson	Packard	Wamp
Hyde	Pallone	Watts (OK)
Inglis	Pappas	Waxman
Istook	Parker	Weldon (FL)
Jackson-Lee	Pascrell	Weldon (PA)
(TX)	Paxon	Weller
Jenkins	Pease	Weygand
John	Peterson (MN)	White
Johnson (CT)	Pickering	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Wicker
Kaptur	Pitts	Wilson
Kasich	Porter	Wolf
Kelly	Portman	Young (AK)
Kennedy (RI)	Quinn	
Kildee	Radanovich	

NAYS—161

Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hilleary
Baldacci	DeFazio	Hilliard
Barr	DeGette	Hinojosa
Barrett (WI)	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Becerra	DeLauro	Hostettler
Berry	Dingell	Hoyer
Blagojevich	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bonior	Doolittle	Jefferson
Borski	Duncan	Johnson (WI)
Boucher	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Jones
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Evans	Kennedy (MA)
Campbell	Farr	Kilpatrick
Capps	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Carson	Fazio	Klecza
Castle	Filner	Klink
Chenoweth	Ford	LaFalce
Clayton	Frank (MA)	Lee
Clement	Furse	Lofgren
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Lucas
Coburn	Goode	Luther
Combest	Gordon	Maloney (CT)
Condit	Greenwood	Markey
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Coyne	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Cramer	Hamilton	Matsui
Crane	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Cummings	Hefley	McDermott
Cunningham	Hefner	McHale
Danner	Herger	McNulty

Meehan	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Meeks (NY)	Price (NC)	Stokes
Millender	Rahall	Stump
McDonald	Rangel	Stupak
Miller (CA)	Reyes	Sununu
Minge	Roemer	Tanner
Mink	Rogers	Tauscher
Moakley	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Thompson
Moran (KS)	Royce	Torres
Moran (VA)	Sabo	Towns
Murtha	Sanders	Trafigant
Neal	Sandlin	Velazquez
Oberstar	Sanford	Vento
Obey	Sawyer	Waters
Olver	Scott	Watkins
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Watt (NC)
Paul	Skaggs	Wexler
Payne	Smith, Adam	Wise
Pelosi	Snyder	Woolsey
Peterson (PA)	Spratt	Wynn
Petri	Stark	Yates
Pombo	Stearns	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Clay	Kennelly	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	King (NY)	Riggs
Fawell	Manton	Rush
Gephardt	Meek (FL)	Sanchez
Gonzalez	Myrick	Scarborough
Goss	Poshard	Schumer

□ 2019

Messrs. HINCHEY, STRICKLAND, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and LEWIS of Georgia changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRIVILEGED REPORT ON REFUSAL OF ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS SUBPOENAED BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-728), together with additional, minority and additional minority views, on the refusal of Attorney General Janet Reno to produce documents subpoenaed by the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-729) on the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3248, DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 543 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 543

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3248) to provide dollars to the classroom. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendments the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 543 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. The rule provides for the traditional 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

It makes in order the Committee on Education and the Workforce amendment in the nature of a substitute now

printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI prohibiting non-germane amendments against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

In addition, the rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the report on the rule, to be offered only in the order printed, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report, with the time equally divided between a proponent and an opponent.

The amendments are considered as read and are not subject to amendment. Also, all points of order are waived against the amendments.

The rule permits the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3248, the underlying legislation, the Dollars to the Classroom Act, is the legislation that implements the sense of the House expressed in House Resolution 139, the Dollars to the Classroom resolution, which passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 310 to 99 last session. When the vast majority of our colleagues voted for House Resolution 139, this House stated very clearly and unequivocally that we believed that the Federal education dollars that are sent to the States should be sent as much as possible directly to our local schools.

The goal we are seeking with the implementing legislation, with this underlying legislation, what we are seeking to accomplish is to make certain that no less than 95 percent of the Department of Education's elementary and secondary education program funds are spent at the local level, where they should be spent. With this bill, more money will go straight to the classroom where it will have, obviously, the best possible impact.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) are to be commended for bringing this important piece of legislation forward. I believe the Committee on Education and the Workforce did a very good job in marking up this bill.

Given that only 5 amendments were offered in the committee of jurisdiction and that the Committee on Rules gave the entire membership of the House 6 days to file amendments on this bill and yet we, in the Committee on Rules, received only 2 amendments, I believe that this structured rule is the correct approach for this bill's consideration.

The rule makes in order all of the amendments that were filed with the Committee on Rules, even though only 2 Members took the time to do so. Any one interested in amending this bill

has had 6 days, Mr. Speaker, to make their amendment plans known. Also, given that we are moving close to the end of the 105th Congress and we have obviously many important issues to resolve in the appropriations process, time is certainly in short supply.

Mr. Speaker, we can do nothing more important than to protect and to strengthen the future of this great Nation, and our children represent the future of this great Nation. We are losing jobs because of some of the evident failures of our educational system, especially in the advanced math and engineering fields.

Seriously addressing the educational needs of our children has become one of the true challenges for the United States of America. We have an obligation to assure that students of all ages receive the best possible education and that the funds entrusted to us by the taxpayers are spent wisely. In the effort by the House of Representatives to send a message of its commitment toward Federal funding for education, I supported the Dollars to the Classroom resolution, urging the Federal bureaucracy to send at least 90 percent of Federal education dollars directly to the classroom. It is important that we put some teeth into that sense of the House Resolution and that we implement what we overwhelmingly agreed was a worthwhile goal.

House Resolution 3248 consolidates and streamlines 31 Federal education programs, giving State and local decision makers increased authority and flexibility in the use of Federal education dollars, and this legislation will send more of the money to the classroom where it will be used to help our students.

No one knows the educational needs of our children better than their teachers.

□ 2030

There is no better way to support education, genuinely, than by sending Federal dollars directly to the schools where it is most needed.

Mr. Speaker, this is very good legislation. I am proud to be supporting it. I believe that House Resolution 543 is also an appropriately structured rule to bring this legislation to the floor, and I urge its adoption. I support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and the underlying bill because the bill makes unprecedented changes in many Federal educational initiatives. Despite that fact, the Committee on Rules chose to block any amendment that might otherwise be offered during floor debate, except two

amendments prefiled with the Committee on Rules.

What is the majority afraid of? Some might say that in the press of business at the end of the fiscal year, we cannot afford open debate and amendment. But this bill was reported from the committee on June 24. Why was that report not filed until September 11, forcing consideration at this busy time?

Mr. Speaker, I fear the process has been manipulated to shut down debate on how this bill will affect millions of children across our Nation. Closed rules are the refuge of those who fear democracy.

Mr. Speaker, our country's public schools are in critical need of our support, our resources, and our guidance. Supporting public education needs to be placed at the forefront of the House's agenda. This bill does just the opposite. Under the guise of reform, H.R. 3248 consolidates many important education programs into a single block grant, with no accountability and no guarantee that the money will be spent on the specific needs for which they were originally intended.

The 31 programs eliminated by this misguided legislation were created for this very reason, to fill existing needs. For example, I remember quite well back in 1987, when I was first in Congress, and Congress passed the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program under the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. I remember it quite well because we wrote it.

Reports issued in the mid-1980s showed that more than 50 percent of the homeless children and youth were not attending school. Homeless children suffer disproportionately from health problems, nutritional deficiencies and developmental disabilities. Uprooted day after day, more than half of them were school drop-outs.

The Congress found it unacceptable for these children to be denied an education, the major source of stability in their lives, and the only hope for these children to build a better life for themselves. The Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program was created because State and local schools were not meeting the responsibility to these children. The program set standards for the placement of homeless children in appropriate schools and provided funding to help supply the tools they would need to be successful in school.

It is hard to do well in school when one does not have the clothes to wear, the books to read, the basic school supplies, a required place to do homework, or transportation to school. Through grants to schools, the program encourages supplemental tutoring and assistance to help these children make up for school time they may have lost when their families became homeless.

Despite periodic attacks levied against it, this program has resulted in

documented improvement in school access and enrollment. Thousands of children have been given a chance to succeed in life that they would not otherwise have had. Our Nation's future is better because we help these children to succeed in education and in life, rather than giving up on them and likely supporting them for much of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that local school districts do not know what to do for the majority of their students, but like governmental officials everywhere, they spend their scarce resources on programs that benefit the majority. They, like all of us, pay attention to their constituents who contact them, who vote and who organize support groups. Unfortunately, homeless families, struggling to survive, do not have the time or the resources to effectively lobby the local school board. Yet a small investment, and it has been a small investment, by the Federal Government can help school districts recognize the homeless children's special needs and meet them, with an enormous return on the investment to both the children and to the community.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of the major reauthorizations of this program, I know its successes. And while I am not as familiar with the other 30 programs that this bill would block grant, I believe it is likely that they, too, are designed to fill an important need that was not being addressed by financially pressed local school districts.

Now, some may consider programs such as the Women's Educational Equity, Gifted and Talented Education, Arts in Education, and the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program, frills. But these small, targeted programs assure that all our children can receive the education that will allow them to become the best that they can be. If these programs are abolished, all accountability to ensure that schools meet the national priorities stated in these programs will also be eliminated.

In fact, this legislation goes as far as to prohibit accountability by barring the Secretary of Education from imposing any meaningful performance or accountability standards regarding the expenditure of funding under this bill. And who do these programs target? The legislation includes a distribution formula which lessens the Federal Government's focus on the children who need our help the most: the poor.

The Federal Government must continue taking an active role in addressing the needs of low-income families. A recent GAO study makes the point that Federal education programs do a better job of targeting resources to those most in need than State and local efforts do. I find it utterly shameful that this House would endorse legislation that shirks our responsibility to the neediest of our children.

Mr. Speaker, this bill overturns decades of Federal education policy. It

ought to receive substantial debate so that Members understand what it will really do. And if that debate sparks Members to think of ways to make the bill better, those Members should have the right to offer germane amendments. This rule provides neither enough time for adequate consideration nor the right for most Members to offer amendments.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule so that this abrupt reversal of Federal education policy can receive the full consideration it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to advise my colleagues that we are privileged that the two Members of this House who are most knowledgeable on this legislation, that will do so much to get dollars to the classroom and not keep the dollars with the bureaucracy in Washington, dollars that our kids need for their public education, those two Members of Congress who most know what this legislation actually will carry out and accomplish, they are here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to make sure I choose my words very carefully, because what the Department of Education has been circulating, what the lobbyists for the chief State school officers is circulating, and what OMB is circulating is, let me find a word, "disingenuous" at the very best. Now, I am being very kind when I say that, because if I used the real language that I should be using it would be much stronger than just "disingenuous."

What they are doing is trying to raise a battle about the appropriation process. So they are trying to mix apples and oranges. Yes, the Committee on Appropriations has reduced funding in this particular area. It will not happen by the time it goes through conference, et cetera; but they have, and so they are trying to use those numbers.

Well, I understand why they are doing this. They do not really have an argument against the legislation. They do not have an argument against the legislation because it sends an additional, at least, \$425 down to every classroom.

Now, what their argument is, that they do not want to come out and say is, we do not want to give up all our bureaucratic jobs. We want to keep these people on the payroll. And that is what the chief school administrator representative is saying. And back in the State: We want to keep them on the State level; spend the money there. Do not worry about children. We know better in the bureaucracy. So, first of

all, they do not have an argument because they know more money gets to the classroom.

They also do not have an argument because they know that we have a hold-harmless 100 percent for all formula grant programs, a hold-harmless program in place for all formula grant programs.

They also do not want to admit that the parents and the local administrators and the local teachers have a far better idea how to spend this money than the bureaucrats in Washington.

Now, the interesting thing is that people will get up and say, oh, they will use this money for playground equipment. They will use this money to build a swimming pool. Well, guess what? The only place they use this money is in the very same programs that now exist. The very same programs.

However, they do not have to fill out 31 applications, page after page after page. They do not have to have all of the rules and regulations that come from the Federal level. We have two pages of accountability in this legislation. Very, very strong accountability language.

Now, I think it would be important to say what the uses of this money, for what they can use this money. I am trying to keep the preposition off the end of the sentence. After all, we are speaking about education. These are the uses of the money:

Let me start with number nine. Programs for homeless children and youth. Now, the only way we could argue that this will not happen is because we do not trust the State; we do not trust the local school district. But, Mr. Speaker, if that school district has a large number of homeless children, they can spend all the money for that purpose. That is the beauty. Each local school can determine that. So if we do not trust our local school districts or if we do not trust our States, then I suppose we would have an argument.

The money will be used for professional development for instructional staff. The money will be used for programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials. The money will be used for programs to improve the higher order thinking skills of disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students, and to prevent students from dropping out of school.

The money will be used in efforts to lengthen the school day or the school year, if that is what the local district believes it should be used for. It will be used for programs to combat illiteracy in the student population. It will be used for programs to provide for the education needs of gifted and talented children.

It will be used for promising education reform projects that are tied to State student content and performance standards. It will be used to carry out comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research.

Do these not all sound very, very familiar? They should, because they are exactly the programs that are out there now.

All we are doing is saying we ought to get 95 cents of that dollar down to the local classroom, where it will make the difference with students, not to the bureaucrats in Washington, not to the bureaucrats in the State, not to some of the private groups, Washington-based. No, to the children; to the teachers, so that, as a matter of fact, they can improve education.

It can be used for programs built upon partnerships between local educational agencies and institutions of higher education. Sounds very familiar, does it not?

It can be used for the acquisition of books, materials and equipment. It can be used for programs to promote academic achievement among women and girls. Does that not sound familiar?

It can be used for programs to provide for the education needs of children with limited English proficiency, or who are American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Hawaiian. It can be used for activities to provide the academic support, enrichment, and motivation to enable all students to reach high State standards.

It can be used for efforts to reduce the pupil-to-teacher ratio. It can be used for projects and programs which assure the participation in mainstream settings in arts and education programs of individuals with disabilities.

I am reading, folks, the 26 uses of the money, which are the 26 uses of the money at the present time.

What do we cut out? We cut out reams and reams and reams of paperwork. If you are a school district and you cannot afford to hire people to sit there day after day, hour after hour, trying to fill out these damnable applications that come from Washington, D.C., you do not get a grant. You do not have a chance.

So all we are cutting out is the bureaucracy in Washington, the bureaucracy in the State, giving an opportunity for parents, children and teachers and administrators on the local level to determine which of these allowable uses are most important to them.

One district may decide to spend half of that money on one or two of these. Another district may decide that there are five or six, but certainly we should not be saying there is a one size fits all. For what York City may need, York suburban may not need, in my own school district. So I hope that when we get into this tomorrow that we will not hear people getting up and misrepresenting what the legislation does, and I hope none of them get up and use any of the, and again, I want to be careful, apparently disingenuous information being put out by the Department of Education and being put out by the lobbyists for the State school officers.

I think it is very, very important that tomorrow's debate has nothing to

do with the appropriation process. That is another time to debate that. If the Members want to debate that, debate that when the appropriation bill comes on the floor but do not take the numbers that that appropriations committee has now produced, because we know that those will not be the numbers by the time the conference is over anyway.

Do not mix apples and oranges. Let us think about children. Let us think about getting money down to the classroom, where it can be used effectively and efficiently to do all the things that we in Washington, D.C. said should be done, but done their way on the local level.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this rule makes the ranking member's amendment, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), to reduce class size in order.

H.R. 3248 continues to be a bad bill. It is not that I do not trust the schools and the school districts, as my good chairman would make us think. I do not trust the Congress and our funding priorities. Claiming that Dollars to the Classroom Act will increase education funding really means that we need some remedial lessons in math and history here on this floor.

The only way dollars to the classroom can increase funds for schools is for Congress to appropriate more money for the block grant. Then each individual program can get more. We already know that that is not going to happen. We have seen the fiscal year 1999 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. We know that the programs being block granted in the Dollars to the Classroom Act are being cut by 20 percent; 20 percent.

That comes as no surprise to those of us who know our history. We know that block grants historically lose funds. A 1995 GAO report found that when Congress created a series of block grants in the early eighties funding for those programs declined significantly.

Here is what the State Superintendent of Public Education in California, Delaine Eastin, wrote to me about H.R. 3248. She said, and I quote, "H.R. 3248 leaves future education funding extremely vulnerable at a time when schools are managing record levels of student enrollment. Growing populations of students with special needs, increased demand for teachers, staggering school construction needs and changing educational technologies."

I urge my colleagues to listen to the lessons of professional educators in their States and in mine. Mathematically and historically, block grants mean less dollars, not more, for our schools and for our students. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am against this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), a distinguished Member of this House who has worked tirelessly on this very important and innovative piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that we understand that Chapter 2 funding was reduced not because of the then minority party. Chapter 2 funding was reduced by the then majority party, a program that all educators loved.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. We have been working almost 2 years on this legislation and it is exciting to get to this point.

I want to especially commend the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), for his tremendous leadership as he has shepherded this through committee and now brought this to the floor and fine-tuned the bill. He has done an outstanding job and all of our thanks go to him.

Before getting to the specifics of the bill, I would like to just mention that the one thing that I am really looking forward to is going back to my district, and every Member can do this, and taking a check like this, because this check to the children of the 16th Congressional District represents money that is freed up from the bureaucracy that is consumed now by the Federal bureaucracy in all kinds of wasted tax dollars, and this money is going to be going directly through the States to the classrooms to these children in all of our schools around the Nation. This is a win for school children, for parents, for teachers, in every one of our districts.

As we probably know, the Dollars to the Classroom Act will consolidate 31 Federal programs into a single flexible grant to the States with the requirement that 95 cents of every one of these Federal dollars gets to the classroom to be used on the priorities of the local teachers and parents, the local schools. It can be used for any one of those authorized 31 programs, but it can be used in the classroom for things such as teachers' salaries, teachers' aides, equipment, books, computer supplies, whatever their needs are. We know that the needs of one district are not necessarily the needs of another district, but they can be used according to the local priorities.

If they want to reduce classroom sizes, if they want to spend it on teaching reading, connecting the classroom to the Internet, whatever their needs are, they can use it all.

It is estimated today by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and we did not consolidate all programs, we did not touch Title I, that is a very efficient program. We did not

touch special ed, migrant ed, voc ed, but we took 31 programs, programs like Goals 2000, School-to-Work, we consolidated them. Those monies that are going to the local school districts are increased because of the flexibility and the reduced requirements for no paper-work, without the administrative requirements that are presently in place.

This could mean an additional approximately \$9,300 per school, approximately \$425 per classroom. Every State wins. Every State is held harmless.

So we are putting our children first, not the bureaucrats first.

Now, look at this chart. Before the Dollars to the Classroom Act, there are the existing 31 programs with all kinds of funds being siphoned off at the Federal level, the State educational agencies, and finally getting down to the schools. After the Dollars to the Classroom Act, we have got a single grant stream directly through the States to the classroom.

I would like to also mention that every State is held harmless, and we have an inflationary grant. This is an authorization bill. This is not an appropriations bill.

Now, I understand the arguments about changing an appropriations bill. Whatever the appropriations level, this will get more of that money into the local classroom.

So it comes down to this argument: Who do you trust with your tax dollars; your local teachers and parents or bureaucrats?

I think all of us should stand with our local parents, teachers, principals and children, the real beneficiaries. Those who are in the place where the real learning takes place, who are going to be the beneficiaries of this bill, stand with them and not the bureaucrats. So I urge my colleagues to help send the dollars to the classroom by supporting the rule.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) if he has any more requests for time?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, not in the chamber at this time.

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, reiterating my support for the underlying legislation and this very fair rule, I also yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-312)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, and matters relating to the measures in that order and in Executive Order 12959 of May 6, 1995, and in Executive Order 13059 of August 19, 1997. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) (IEEPA), section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 and does not deal with those relating to the emergency declared on November 14, 1979, in connection with the hostage crisis.

I. On March 15, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12957 (60 Fed. Reg. 14615, March 17, 1995) to declare a national emergency with respect to Iran pursuant to IEEPA, and to prohibit the financing, management, or supervision by United States persons of the development of Iranian petroleum resources. This action was in response to actions and policies of the Government of Iran, including support for international terrorism, efforts to undermine the Middle East peace process, and the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. A copy of the Order was provided to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate by letter dated March 15, 1995.

Following the imposition of these restrictions with regard to the development of Iranian petroleum resources, Iran continued to engage in activities that represent a threat to the peace and security of all nations, including Iran's continuing support for international terrorism, its support for acts that undermine the Middle East peace process, and its intensified efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. On May 6, 1995, I issued Executive Order 12959 (60 Fed. Reg. 24757, May 9, 1995) to further respond to the Iranian threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The terms of that order and an earlier order imposing an import ban on Iranian-origin goods and services (Executive Order 12613 of October 29, 1987) were consolidated and clarified in Executive Order 13059 of August 19, 1997.

At the time of signing Executive Order 12959, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize through specific licensing certain transactions, including transactions by United States persons related to the Iran-United